UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,196	08/15/2000	Arto Palin	4925-40	1563

7590 08/20/2003

Michael C Stuart
Cohen Pontani Lieberman & Pavane
551 Fifth Avenue
Suite 1210
New York, NY 10176

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, HAU H	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2676	

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

REMARKS

The Examiner has examined and rejected claims 1 to 36 of the present patent application. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-17, 25-28, 32, and 34-36 have been rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nahi (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,584) in view of Wharton et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,584). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 5-7, 21, 29, and 33 of the present patent application under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nahi (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,584) in view of Wharton et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,584) and further in view of Thomas (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,160). Furthermore, the Examiner also rejected claims 24 and 31 of the present patent application under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nahi (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,584) in view of Wharton et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,584) and further in view of Sharma (U.S. Patent No. 6,287,200).

Before discussing the rejected claims in detail, a brief discussion of Applicant's invention is warranted. The present invention is directed towards providing better display quality for those using a mobile device such as a mobile phone, laptop computer, personal digital assistant (PDA) and an external display device via standard communications link technology, such as, but not limited to, but not limited to GSM, EDGE, WCDMA, DAB, DVB or Bluetooth thereby establishing a short range communications path between the two devices. As specified in the preferred embodiment of the present invention provided the ability of mobile terminal to receive image data from a base station or system in a wireless communications network utilizing one of these transmission or communications techniques. As used herein, the term "image" is used interchangeably with the term "video" to either mean a single image, picture, or graphic, a stream or plurality of still frames, graphics, or a conventional video.

The preset invention includes both a first display device and second display device that are able communicate with each other through a short range RF communication link. The image displayed on the first display takes into consideration the capabilities of the first display device while the image found on the second display device will take into account the display capabilities of the second display device. Additionally, the first display device also has a means of connecting to the second display device through a wireless network communication link. In accordance with the present invention, a resident application on the first display device is used to split the received image payload into a plurality of data packets. After splitting the payload into a plurality of data packets, the application program identifies what packets are to either remain and be displayed on the first device as well as what packets are to be sent to the second display device.

The image data received by the display device comprises data that is ultimately reassembled into an image that can be displayed on both devices or on either device or even another display device. If a mobile device has a relatively small display or it does not have a display, the image can be retransmitted via some form of short-range communications, such as a Bluetooth link, to an external display device for viewing. This capability enables a service provider to offer more advanced service, such as images and/or video movies with higher resolution than could be effectively provided on an ordinary display of a mobile phone.

Therefore, the Applicants contend that the features and capabilities as recited in the claims clearly define both the novelty and the non-obviousness of the present invention over the teachings of the references cited by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request re-examination and reconsideration of the above referenced patent application in view of the changes in the claims and the remarks as set forth below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-17, 25-28, 32, and 34-36 have been rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nahi (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,584) in view of Wharton et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,584). The Examiner contends that one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to combine Nahi's disclosed inventive concept or method "of interaction between a PDA device and an external display" with the method of synchronizing the display of data relating to a pre-determined application between an interactive terminal and at least one mobile interface device having a display." The Applicants respectfully disagrees and points out that at Nahi only discloses a portable display tablet that cooperatively operates with a computer system executing an application program that generate predetermined graphics data and operates in response to predetermined input data from a network-based system. Nahi also disclosed a portable display tablet that comprises a graphics display panel for displaying predetermined graphical data and content, wireless data transceiver for short-range communication between a network-based system and the portable display tablet. Therefore, the portable display tablet only provides a wireless interface to a local host computer system that emulates any and all activity that is produced and appears the display the host computer system.

Additionally, Nahi only discloses a controller or microprocessor interfaced to a wireless data transceiver capable of executing a pre-defined control program to process data and or content from sent from application programs that reside on the network-based host system. The control program processes the inbound data and or content and properly positions or presents the processed data and or content on the display panel of the tablet. Unlike the method as recited in claim 1 and the program system as recited in claim 20, the control program, disclosed in Nahi, is not capable of making any determination as to the manner by which data or content is to be displayed or what attribute are required to be used to display or how the data or content is to be on the display panel of one or more display tablets. More precisely, the control program only is used to position the data and or content received from a host system on the display panel of the portable

display tablet in exactly the same manner as would be seen on the display of the host system. The only other thing disclosed by Nahi is that the graphical data and or content is compressed prior to transmission by the local host computer system to the portable display tablet. Therefore, Nahi does not teach or suggest the ability of parsing and splitting an image of pre-determined content captured by a first mobile device or terminal and transmitting it to another mobile terminal in accordance with the display attributes of the other mobile terminal. Nor does Nahi disclose, teach or suggest the ability of transmitting an image of pre-determined content to multiple mobile display devices or terminals in accordance with the display attributes of the other terminals.

The Examiner also asserted that Wharton discloses a method of synchronizing the display of data relating to a predetermined application between a set-top transceiver device that is operatively coupled to an interactive terminal that receives user input from the at least one mobile interface device is similar to the method of parsing and splitting an image of pre-determined content captured by a first mobile device or terminal and transmitting it to one or more mobile terminals in accordance with the display attributes of each mobile terminal or device as recited by claims 1, 20, and 28 of the present invention. The Applicants once again respectfully disagree and would like to point out that the method of synchronization disclosed by Wharton is merely a signal that is transmitted from a device such as a set-top transceiver to one or more mobile interface devices and interactive terminal. The synchronization signal is used as a control signal for controlling the display of one or more mobile interface devices and interactive terminals. In fact, the Applicants have thoroughly reviewed Wharton and found no mention of capturing an image by a mobile device or terminal, parsing that digitized image into a plurality of image segments that are then split into images and transmitted to one or more mobile devices or terminals taking into account the display attribute and capabilities of each mobile device or terminal receiving the image. Therefore, Wharton does not teach or suggest the ability of parsing and splitting an image of pre-determined content captured by a first mobile

device or terminal and transmitting it to another mobile terminal in accordance with the display attributes of the other mobile terminal.

In sum, Nahi and Wharton fail to recite the above-referenced limitations found in independent claims 1, 20, and 28. In addition, Nahi and Wharton are also inconsistent with the limitations recited in independent claims 1, 20, 28. In addition, after a fair reading of Wharton, in particular, it does not reveal all the limitations of any of the independent claims of the present invention. Therefore, Nahi and Wharton do not render the claimed invention unpatentable as recited by the independent claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 8,9, 11, 12, 14-17 that are dependent from Claim 1, are patentable for at least the same reasons as stated for Claim 1.

Claims 25, 26, 27 that are dependent from Claim 20, are patentable for at least the same reasons as stated for Claim 20.

Claims, 32, 34-36 that are dependent from Claim 28, are patentable for at least the same reasons as stated for Claim 28.

REJECTION BASED ON NAHI, WHARTON AND THOMAS:

The Examiner has rejected claims 5-7, 21, 29, and 33 of the present patent application under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nahi (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,584) in view of Wharton et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,584) and further in view of Thomas (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,160). The Examiner contends that one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to combine Nali that discloses the interaction between a mobile display device and a network-based host system with the method of synchronizing the data generated by an application on a set-top box or transceiver with at least one mobile interface device or terminal where the transmitted data is to be displayed and the method of data transfer, as disclosed in Thomas, that exploits a broadcast system to enhance a typical wireless gaming experience by employing position holders to replace specified data element.

Once again, the Applicants respectfully disagree and would like to point out that Thomas only discloses a system and methodology of supplementing the data delivery capabilities of a wireless network. As FIG 2 in Thomas shows a wireless data system comprising a wireless network, a data server, in this case a server specifically directed to a gaming environment, an array of base stations and handheld wireless devices as well as a broadcast transmitter. Here, the data server that is connected to the wireless network to provide gaming information comprising video or graphic data content to the rest of the network. The data server generates game visuals, backgrounds, characters, audio, movements, general data, etc., that is transmitted through the wireless network to a user's hand-held device.

Thomas also discloses that the wireless data system also includes the broadcast transmitter that is connected to the data server. The data server therefore splits the data going to the handheld wireless devices. The video or graphic data content is divided into an array of data elements or segments, with one or more data portions being transmitted to the plurality of handheld wireless devices through the wireless network. While the other elements or segments are broadcast through one or more broadcast transmitters to the plurality of handheld wireless devices. The Applicants would like to assert that the method splitting disclosed in Thomas very much different than that recited in claims 1, 20, and 28 of the preset invention. In Thomas the requirements for slitting data content between the broadcast transmitters and via the data server is to accommodate the need to transmit and refresh large portions of video and or graphic content to support a gaming experience on a wireless hand-held device. In contrast, the claimed invention uses a splitting mechanism to parse an image into an array of digital display elements so that the of image can be customized to fit and be properly presented on a mobile display device or terminal in accordance with the display attributes or capabilities of the mobile display device or terminal.

Therefore, under MPEP §706.02(j), in order for the Examiner to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to

one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. No such suggestion or motivation is present here. No one having ordinary skill in the art would have considered using the techniques disclosed in Nahi, Wharton and Thomas to the ability of parsing and splitting an image of pre-determined content captured by a first mobile device or terminal and transmitting it to another mobile terminal in accordance with the display attributes of the other mobile terminal. Furthermore, no one of ordinary skill in the art would have contemplated or been motivated to modify Nahi, Wharton and Thomas in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, neither Nahi, Wharton nor Thomas either singly or in combination, discloses or suggests at least the method or technique as claimed by the applicant in claim 1, 20, and or 28.

Claims 5, 6, and 7 recite similar subject matter to claim 1 and as such, are patentable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claim 21 that are dependent from Claim 20, are patentable for at least the same reasons as stated for Claim 20.

Claims 29 and 31 that are dependent from Claim 28 are patentable for at least the same reasons as stated for Claim 28.

REJECTION BASED ON NAHI, WHARTON AND SHARMA:

The Examiner has rejected claims 5-7, 21, 29, and 33 of the present patent application under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nahi (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,584) in view of Wharton et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,584) and further in view of Sharma (U.S. Patent No. 6,287,200). The Examiner contends that one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to combine Nali that discloses the interaction between a mobile display device and a network-based host system with the method of synchronizing the data generated by an application on a set-top box or transceiver with at least one mobile interface device or terminal where the transmitted data is to be displayed and the method, as disclosed in Sharma, "of

enabling multiple participants, or players to play a virtual game with each other utilizing respective mobile devices."

Once again, the Applicants respectfully disagree and would like to assert that Sharma only discloses a system and method for supplementing the data delivery capabilities of a wireless network. In accordance with the present invention, as recited by independent claims 1, 20, and 28 that are supplemented and supported by the respective dependent claims, an application mechanism or program that resides on the first display device captures and then splits the received image payload into a plurality of data packets. After splitting the payload into a plurality of data packets, this mechanism or program, as recited in independent claims 20 and 28 identifies what packets will remain and be displayed on the first device as well as what packets are to be sent to and will be displayed on the second display device in accordance with the display capabilities or attributed of that display. Sharma, on the other hand, only discloses a method and system for playing a virtual game with the multiple participants, or players, of the game that are located at random locations. In fact, as done previously, the Applicants have thoroughly reviewed Sharma and found that there is no mention of capturing an image by a mobile device or terminal, parsing that digitized image into a plurality of image segments that are then split into images and transmitted to one or more mobile devices or terminals taking into account the display attribute and capabilities of each mobile device or terminal receiving the image. Therefore, Sharma does not teach or suggest the ability of parsing and splitting an image of pre-determined content captured by a first mobile device or terminal and transmitting it to another mobile terminal in accordance with the display attributes of the other mobile terminal.

Once again and as previously stated above, the Examiner must establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Additionally, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. No such suggestion or motivation is present here. No one having ordinary skill in the art would have considered using the techniques